This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

E. D. G[illegible]-S

Digitized by Google

WHITNEY LIBRARY,

HARVARD UNIVERSITY.

THE GIFT OF

J. D. WHITNEY,

Sturgis Hooper Professor

IN THE

MUSEUM OF COMPARATIVE ZOÖLOGY.

19,666.

July 9, 1904.

Digitized by Google

19,868

MEMOIR

OF

JOHN LAWRENCE LeCONTE.

1825-1883.

BY

SAMUEL H. SCUDDER.

Read before the National Academy, April 17, 1884.

Judd & Detweiler, Printers, Washington, D. C.

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

MEMOIR

OF

JOHN LAWRENCE LeCONTE.

1825-1883.

BY

SAMUEL H. SCUDDER.

READ BEFORE THE NATIONAL ACADEMY, APRIL 17, 1884.

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

BIOGRAPHICAL MEMOIR OF JOHN LAWRENCE LECONTE.

The revocation of the edict of Nantes, with its attendant persecutions and other horrors, was incidentally of advantage to science; for of the tens of thousands who expatriated themselves from a community given over to tyranny and fanaticism, not a few carried with them and transmitted to their offspring, born in the land of refuge, a spirit of scientific investigation, which was doubtless quickened by the intense life of the time; and in after years, when the hereditary trait again appeared, it may often have found its healthy growth re-enforced by the admixture of the new element afforded by residence in a foreign country. At all events other countries owe much of their scientific fame to the men of Huguenot ancestry, who fled from the intolerance of Louis XIV, and whose influence outside of France would but for this have certainly been lessened for lack of direct contact; for among the Huguenots, or their descendants, as has frequently been pointed out, was an unusual proportion of men devoted to science, literature, and the arts. Thus, to mention but a few names, Switzerland owes to this movement her DeCandolles, and Saussures, with Plantamour and a host of lesser lights; Germany and Holland, Charpentier and Lyonet; and our own country, Bowdoin, of Cambridge, an early president of the American Academy; John Jay, of New York, and the LeContes, living and dead.

The name of LeConte, or LeComte, as it was indifferently spelled, was a frequent one in France in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, and particularly in Normandy. The families were mostly of noble blood, and many were possessed of considerable estates; others, however, were born in poverty, of whom some came to a more honorable distinction than wealth or title could give, such as the learned Antoine LeConte, a jurist of Noyon, famous for his attacks on Calvin, or the other Antoine, possibly a direct descendant, who was Baron de l'Echelle and governor of Sedan, and was well known

Digitized by Google

in Huguenot times for his controversial letters addressed to a Jesuit; but whether of noble or plebeian blood we rarely find their names in those days, excepting as stanch Huguenots, and without leaving Normandy we come to such cases as that of Isaac LeComte, of Coutances, who, in 1687, at the age of sixty, was sentenced to the galleys because a book "of the religion" was found in his house; and of Daniel LeConte, of Poitou, sent to the galleys the following year for the crime of being a Huguenot; of Abraham and Henry LeConte, who fled to England in 1687 for conscience and life's sake; and of Guillaume and Pierre LeConte, besides others of the same name, who took refuge in our country.

Guillaume, with whom we are specially concerned, was born at Rouen, March 6, 1659. His exact ancestry is unknown; but from seals still in the possession of the family, and to judge from the researches of Dr. LeConte, it seems tolerably evident that he was descended, through his mother or grandmother, from the barons of Nonant, a Norman family of importance, and that he or his father adopted the name of the maternal line.* In the troubles which arose in his early manhood, Guillaume, finding that neither justice nor liberty would be allowed him in his native country, fled to Holland and cast in his fortunes with the Prince of Orange. "At the time of his arrival in Holland," writes Major LeConte in a manuscript at hand, "William, the Stadtholder, was preparing to invade England, and readily accepted the offer of my ancestor's service in his army. With him he proceeded to England," and apparently remained in his army until it was disbanded after the peace of Ryswick, for we find him with that army at the conquest of Ireland, and the family still retain a fine folio Elzevir Bible of 1669, presented to Guillaume by William III, in token of his friendship. Moreover it was in the year following the peace of Ryswick, namely in 1698, that Guillaume emigrated to this country with two nephews,

* Dr. LeConte, in a letter to Rev. C. W. Baird, says: "The tradition in my family is that my ancestor was so disgusted with the political conditions of France that when he went to Holland he dropped his father's and took his mother's name. . . . The LeConte seal is quartered at the lower right hand corner, and indicates a female of the family of that name of the seigneurs of Nonant, Bretoncelles, etc." But it is not known, I believe, that any Huguenots changed their name for the cause here assigned, and it seems more probable that the change was made by himself or an ancestor for some purely family reason.

Digitized by Google

Thomas and Henri, of the Nonant line. These two nephews, it may be said in passing, married in this country, but left no children.

Shortly after his arrival in New York he is said to have made a voyage to the West Indies,* where he met and married, February 16, 1701, Margueritte de Valleau, daughter of Pierre Joyeulx de Valleau, of Martinique. If so, he soon returned to New York and purchased a considerable estate, aided by presents from King William. His wife's father must soon have died, perhaps before they returned to New York, for they early came into possession of her father's estates in Martinique, and sold in New York the sugar produced thereon. The date of his wife's death is not known, but it could not have been long after the birth of their only son, William, (December 3, 1702), for on April 17th of the following year he married a second time, Margaret Mahant (Mahoo, Mahoe, or Mahault), by whom he had two other children, Pierre and Esther. He and his second wife died in New York on the same day, September 15, 1720, of yellow fever.

William, the son of the first wife, married Anne (Marie Ann) Beslie, of New Rochelle,† and had two daughters, through the second of whom, Susanne, who married another Besley (or Bayley), comes the family of that name, in whose succession were Mother Seton, the founder of the Sisters of Charity in this country, and the late Archbishop Bayley, of Baltimore.

Of the marriage or descendants of Esther nothing is known to

---

*"No evidence has been recorded to show that Guillaume ever went to Martinique; it is much more probable that Margueritte had come with her father to New Rochelle, but continued to refer her home to the island from which they had emigrated."—Family records by Prof. LeConte Stevens. It may be added that the name of Pierre Valleau appears on the New Rochelle list from the earliest period.

†A romantic story is told of this son in Major LeConte's manuscript to the effect that he made a visit to his mother's relatives in the West Indies, and was there betrothed to a Miss Dugand. Before the time of the proposed marriage business took him to New York for a few months, and he then returned to claim his bride. On landing at St. Pierre's and inquiring about his betrothed, who lived some miles out of the city, he was told she had married, whereupon he at once re-embarked on a vessel just sailing for New York, determined to marry without delay the first lady who should show any regard for his attentions. In a few days he met Miss Beslie, and soon married her. He afterwards learned that it was another Miss Dugand, and not his betrothed, of whose marriage he had heard.

Digitized by Google

me.* The descent of the family name comes through Pierre,† who lived in New Jersey, and married, first, Margaret Pintard, and, three years later, Valeria Eatton, of Eattonville, New Jersey. The first left no children, the second five—William, John Eatton, Margaret, Thomas, and Peter. William married, but died childless. Thomas and Peter did not marry. Margaret married Rev. Jedediah Chapman, one of the founders of the Presbyterian church in this country. So again the male descent and name comes solely through one son, John Eatton, who was born September 2, 1739, and married Jane Sloan in 1776, by whom he had three children—William, who died at the age of thirty, unmarried; Lewis, born in 1782, who lived in Georgia, where he married Anne Quartermann, and was the father of Professors John and Joseph LeConte, of the University of California, the only living children out of four sons and three daughters; and finally John Eatton, born in Shrewsbury, New Jersey, February 22, 1784, who married Mary Anne H. Lawrence in July, 1821, and had three sons, two Edwards, both of whom died in infancy, and the subject of the present notice, John Lawrence, who was born May 13, 1825.‡

As the life of Dr. LeConte was an uneventful one, its principal incidents may be merely sketched. At the completion of his collegiate course at Mt. St. Mary's College, in Emmettsburg, Maryland, he entered the College of Physicians and Surgeons in New York, from which he was graduated in 1846. Although he thus made medicine his declared profession, he never followed its practice to any extent, inheriting, as he did, means sufficient to render him independent. From 1848 to 1850 he made several journeys to Lake Superior and California to increase his knowledge of our fauna. In 1852 his father's family removed to Philadelphia, where he has since resided, marrying in 1861—the year after his father's death—the daughter of the late Judge Grier, who, with two sons, survives him. He made other expeditions at various times, both before and after his marriage, to Honduras and Panama, the Rocky Mountains, Europe,

* See Appendix.

† "Dr. Peter LeConte . . . settled in New Jersey, becoming a resident of Monmouth county as early as 1734. In Middletown he practiced medicine for many years, and there is a tradition that he sometimes preached as a minister."—Family records by Prof LeConte Stevens.

‡ Fuller details of the genealogy of the family will be found in an appendix.

Digitized by Google

Egypt, and Algiers. At the outbreak of the civil war he entered the army medical corps as surgeon of volunteers, and was soon advanced to the post of medical inspector, with the rank of lieutenant colonel, where he remained until the close of the war. In this field his fine organizing power and good sense showed themselves to excellent advantage. After this he held no post demanding his time until 1878, when he entered the United States Mint in Philadelphia, a position which he retained until his death, which occurred November 15th last.

Francis Galton, in his work on "Hereditary Genius," and Alphonse DeCandolle, in his "Histoire des sciences et des savants depuis deux siecles," have clearly proved the influence of heredity in the development of scientific men. To mention a single example, DeCandolle points out that among the ninety-two persons who had been the chosen "foreign associates" of the French Academy of Sciences up to the time of his writing, a father and a son occur no less than four times, a number which is suprising when we consider that the election was made out of about twelve hundred men of science. The influences which affect the study of this question among ourselves are diversified, for here, perhaps, better than anywhere else in the world, one may carve out one's own destiny, and a man of genius may consequently more readily rise from the lower ranks; our lineage, too, is so much more mixed, and in a large proportion of cases so obscure, that the traces of hereditary character are less readily discernible; yet, to pass by all names that are in close relation with European immigration, we have some clear instances of family influence in science alone, as may be seen by repeating merely the names of Dana, Draper, Eatton, Harris, Hitchcock, Pickering, Pierce, Rogers, and Whitney, and especially LeConte, while if we were to include, as we should, the mother's side, we should have to add such related names as Franklin and Bache, to which, no doubt, a serious research would add illustrious examples. But the historical element of our country is so modern, our professional life so unstable as it were, the growth and opportunities of scientific culture so recent, that in nearly all these instances we have but the connection of a single pair of names; hence it is that the name of LeConte is here somewhat conspicuous.

Pierre, the great-grandfather of Dr. LeConte and son of the original Guillaume, was a physician of some distinction in his day, and possessed, through his success, considerable property. His second wife,

Digitized by Google

through whom the descent comes, was a sister of Dr. Joseph Eatton. The sons all appear to have been men of more than ordinary character, but it is not known that any of them had any special scientific tastes. The eldest, William,* moved to Georgia, and the others followed, spending the winters on their plantations there, but still retaining their possessions in the North. John Eatton, the first, probably lived at first at Shrewsbury, as his children were all born there, summer and winter.† But he had interests with William in Georgia, and ultimately removed there to a plantation of his own in Liberty county, where, in the open life of the South, his sons (or at any rate all but William, who died unmarried, in early manhood) developed a strong taste for the study of nature, which one can hardly believe was not from some predilection or guidance on their father's part. However that may be, Louis, who lived, married, and died in Georgia, succeeding there to his father's estates, was a man of unusual attainments for those days in many departments of science, and although he never published any of the results of his studies he contributed freely to the labors of others. He studied medicine in his youth with Dr. Hosack. He established on his plantation in

* "William LeConte . . . was a lawyer by profession, and took an active part in the Revolutionary struggle. On the 22d of June, 1775, he was appointed a member of the first 'Council of Safety' for the Province of Georgia, and was likewise a member of the 'Provincial Congress' which met in Savannah on the 4th of July, 1775, representing the Parish of St. Philip, or great Ogeechee. On the 8th of August, 1775, as a member of the Council of Safety, he signed a letter addressed to Governor Sir James Wright, and his name appears on the 'black list' which the royal Governor of Georgia sent to England, with the annexed title of 'Rebel Counselor.'"—Family records by Prof. LeConte Stevens. See also Rev. Dr. Stevens' History of Georgia, Vol. II, pp. 101, 105, 123.

† "William and John Eatton must have removed to Georgia some time before the breaking out of the American Revolution, but in after life they seem to have divided their time between Georgia and New Jersey. They are said to have carried on jointly a profitable lumber business with the West India Islands, from their lands at 'Sans Souci,' on the Ogeechee river, about sixteen miles south of Savannah. . . . John Eatton, . . . after living with his brother at Sans Souci, in Georgia, purchased extended lands adjacent to the southern boundary of the 'Midway Settlement,' in Liberty county, about twenty miles south of Sans Souci. The exact date of this purchase is not now known. There is no evidence that he adopted any learned profession, or had any occupation beyond that of taking care of his property."—Family records by Prof. LeConte Stevens.

Digitized by Google

Georgia a botanical garden, which was especially rich in bulbous plants from the Cape of Good Hope, and a laboratory, in which he tested the discoveries of the chemists of his day. He devoted much time also to mathematical studies, and manuscripts on this subject, as well as on the animals and plants of Georgia, were in the possession of his family, but perished during the war in the burning of Columbia in February, 1865.* Of his four sons two died at about

---

*"While in college (Columbia College) with his younger brother, John Eatton, Lewis manifested a marked fondness for natural science. He made a botanical exploration of Manhattan Island before his removal to Georgia, where the enlargement of the field of observation and research led to the cultivation of nearly all the branches of natural science, including botany, zoölogy, chemistry, and physics. Aided by his brother, John Eatton, he introduced improvements in the culture of rice lands, reclaiming much of 'Bulltown swamp,' which traversed his estates.

He made himself thoroughly familiar with the botany and zoölogy of the entire coast of Georgia, and upon one of his plantations in the neighborhood of the homestead he established a botanical garden, which was especially rich in bulbous plants. He was among the first to produce the beautiful hybrid known as Amaryllis Johnsonii. His camelias, which were cultivated in the open air, were famous, the trunk of one of these trees, a double white, attaining a diameter of thirteen inches or more near the ground and a height of nearly twenty feet. As late as 1860 this garden, though abandoned, was remarkable, and during that year I saw in it camelia trees over twelve feet in height. . . . In consequence of an unconquerable aversion to appearing in print he published nothing himself, but handed the fruits of his investigations over to his scientific friends. The monographs of his brother, Major LeConte, . . . were enriched by his observations. In like manner Stephen Elliott, of South Carolina, and other contemporary botanists acknowledged their obligations to him. He made excursions into the adjacent counties, including one of the regions bordering on the Altahama river, in company with the botanist, Dr. William Baldwin, U. S. A., and a subsequent excursion with Mr. Gordon, the Scotch collector and botanist, who published an account in the *Gardener's Magazine*, Vol. VIII, of the result of many months' residence with Mr. LeConte. . . . Mr. Gordon asserts that Lewis LeConte's garden is the richest in bulbs that he has seen. He gives Mr. LeConte the credit of having solved the problem of the 'natural succession of forest trees.' In one of the upper rooms of his house at Woodmanston Lewis LeConte established a chemical laboratory. . . . His varied and accurate knowledge of science, especially of medicine, was of great service to the community in which he lived. He also devoted considerable attention to mathematical subjects, and among others to that of 'magic squares.'"—Family records by Prof. LeConte Stevens.

Digitized by Google

the age of thirty, one of them (Lewis)* already showing a strong taste for science, while the others, still living and members of our own body, are sufficiently known to you to need from me no statement of their important and varied contributions to science. The same tastes were developed also among his daughters.†

The youngest son of John Eatton, bearing his father's name, and who was the father of Dr. LeConte, is better known than his brother in scientific literature. He lived most of his life in New York, inheriting that portion of his father's landed property which lay in

---

*"Lewis LeConte . . . entered Franklin College, Athens, Ga., in 1838, and after graduation went to Cambridge, Mass., where he studied law. . . . In boyhood Lewis manifested much mechanical ingenuity; was very fond of the chase, and attained extraordinary skill in the use of the rifle. At college he was specially interested in chemistry, and this interest he retained afterward. . . . His love of science was for its own sake rather than for any material benefit to be derived from its application. . . . Had he lived longer there is reason to think his attention would have been concentrated upon science. He never exhibited any fondness for politics, but, like his father, kept a private chemical laboratory in his house, and rather avoided public life."—Family record by Prof. LeConte Stevens.

†"Ann LeConte . . . was specially characterized by her ardent love of nature, her keen appreciation of art, so far as opportunities for culture in this were presented, her high sense of duty, and her devotion to religion. Her love of nature was an inheritance, and showed itself especially in her fondness for flowers, which was early imbued by her father. Wherever her home was made a flower garden was to her an indispensable adjunct, and the zeal and industry applied in its cultivation were never unrewarded. . . . That her mind was naturally of mathematical order was shown by her precision in music and her clear conception of form, of proportion, of number. Her advancement in this department of study in girlhood was uncommonly rapid; without further development it was only possible for such tendencies to continue presenting themselves through life without resulting in the accomplishment of any special work that might command public recognition. When the homestead in Walthourville was contemplated she studied architecture and landscape gardening, and not a single feature in the plan of the house and its surroundings was decided without her scrutiny, criticism, and decision."

One of her children, Walter LeConte Stevens, from whose "family records" I have taken the above and previous notes, a professor in the Packer Collegiate Institute of Brooklyn, N. Y., and who graduated in 1868 from the University of South Carolina, has contributed also to the renown of the family name in science by articles, mostly on physiological optics, published in the *American Journal of Science*. Several of his educational addresses have also been published.

Digitized by Google

the North, as his brother did that in the South. Entering the corps of topographical engineers of the United States army, with the rank of captain, at the age of thirty-four, he remained in the Government service until 1831, attaining in 1828 the rank of brevet major "for ten years' faithful service."* His tastes were many sided, but his special studies—those which were the passion of his life—were in natural history. Before he entered the engineer corps he published a catalogue of the plants of New York city in the journal edited by the Dr. Hosack under whom his brother had studied medicine, and in subsequent years, during his connection with the army and afterwards, he published special studies on Utricularia, Gratiola, Ruellia, Tillandsia, Viola, and Pancratium, as well as our native grape vines, tobacco, and pecan-nut. He published also a variety of papers on mammals, reptiles, batrachians, and crustacea, mostly of a systematic character, and collected a vast amount of original material for the natural history of our insects, as may be seen by a single installment, that was published in Paris in conjunction with Boisduval, upon North American butterflies. Coleoptera, however, may be said to have been his speciality, particularly in the lattter part of his career, though he published only four papers upon them, and mainly upon a single family, Histeridæ. He not only amassed a

* It is stated in some accounts of Major LeConte that have been published, and also in some manuscript notices I have seen, that Major LeConte entered the engineer corps in 1813 as one of the military engineers and that he projected or constructed several of the fortifications along the Atlantic sea-board, especially those about Savannah and at Old Point Comfort in Virginia (see Hist. Mag., V. 30). The army records, however, show that his commission bore date of April 18, 1818; that he was breveted for "ten years' faithful service" April 18, 1828, and resigned August 30, 1831; furthermore, that he was attached to the topographical engineers, then distinct from the military engineers, and that his probable service in these works was the preliminary surveys which simply fixed the position and guided the construction of the fortifications themselves.

"Major LeConte was . . . about five feet six inches in height, with rather dark complexion, blue eyes, and aquiline nose. In disposition he was usually sociable and sufficiently communicative, but occasionally reticent and secluded, strong in his affections and aversions, and much beloved by his relatives whom he visited in Georgia. . . . For a number of years he was a member of the Episcopal Church, but he subsequently became a Roman Catholic, and in this faith he died."—Family records by Prof. LeConte Stevens. Dr. LeConte was brought up a Catholic, but after marriage attended the Protestant Episcopal Church.

Digitized by Google

considerable collection, but he left behind a most extensive series of water-color illustrations of our native insects and plants made with his own hands. It was natural, then, that his only child, upon whom he spent all his devotion, and whose mother had died when he was only a few weeks old, should share in these tastes of his father and almost sole companion.

Coming from such a stock it is not surprising that a decided taste for natural history, and even for the special branch entomology, in which he was engaged during an active life, should appear in the early youth of Dr. LeConte. He himself told how strong was his early passion while still at Mt. St. Mary's College. That it soon took the definite form of investigation is shown by the fact that while a medical student, at the early age of nineteen, he published his first paper, containing descriptions of twenty-odd species of Carabidæ from the eastern United States.

As must be the case with an intelligent student engaged in any branch of systematic zoölogy, his attention was quickly drawn to anomalies of geographical distribution, and we accordingly find him in one of his early papers drawing attention to several species of Coleoptera common to the North American and European continents, whose distribution could not be attributed to commerce; and in a brief but pregnant essay on the geographical distribution of Coleoptera in the northern part of our continent, appended to his contribution to Agassiz's "Lake Superior," distinguishing "the different kinds of replacement of species which are observed in passing from one zoölogical district to another," and nicely defining the distinction between "analogous" and "equivalent" species. "The prevailing character of tropical faunas," he says, "is individuality; the production of peculiar forms within limited regions; while the distinguishing feature of temperate and arctic faunas is the repetition of similar or identical forms through extensive localities." Such passages, written thirty-five years ago, mean far more than if first published now, and disclose a mind quick to grasp generalities, fertile in ideas, terse and discriminating in expression.

The subject of the faunal relations of animals was a favorite one with LeConte. He returned to it again and again; he was the first to district much of the vast and then almost unexplored regions west of our prairie country. The foundation of this work was laid in his essay on the distribution of California beetles, read to the American Association in 1851. With slight modifications the con-

Digitized by Google

clusions then reached were confirmed in his report of the Stevens division of the Pacific railroad survey, published in 1860; while in the same year a more elaborate and extended survey of the whole western country (excepting the then still unexplored region of the Great Basin) was given in his Coleoptera of Kansas and New Mexico. In this, following only in part the division suggested by Agassiz (who first laid down the primal geographical boundaries of North American faunas), he showed what remarkable differences were to be found within comparatively restricted areas in the western portion of our country, and laid the foundation for the special work that has since followed, in which the region here first mapped has been the point of greatest dispute.

He carried these studies a stage further when, in his presidential address to the American Association in 1875, he attempted, by collating the known facts concerning the actual distribution of certain of our Coleoptera which affect the seashore, but are also found in outlying spots upon the beaches of inland lakes, to prove the comparative antiquity of these forms; some of them, he endeavored to show, were unchanged survivors of species which lived on the shores of the cretaceous ocean when the Rocky Mountain and Appalachian districts were separated by a wide stretch of open sea, and other species were either older or somewhat less ancient. By investigations of this kind he hoped that we might recover important fragments of the past history of the earth, where the rocks disclosed no proofs. It must, however, be said that such propositions are to be considered speculative until supported here and there by the discovery of at least a few types from the tertiaries, if not from older rocks, identical with those now living upon the surface. It is not much to say that no such proofs have yet been found, for the careful study of fossil Coleoptera has scarcely more than begun, and of the numerous forms which have been exhumed in our own country at Florissant and other localities, already amounting to four or five hundred species of Coleoptera, very few indeed have been published. If, upon careful study, none out of this considerable number should prove identical with living types, and especially if species should occur nearly related to the forms specified by LeConte in the way of illustration, the force of the considerations presented by him will be weakened, and some modified explanation will be required of the anomalies of distribution to which he has called attention. For this we must await the results which are forthcoming. Meanwhile

Digitized by Google

the suggestions made in this address and the additions to them in his paper on Rocky Mountain Coleoptera in the "Bulletin" of Hayden's Survey in 1878, in which he expressed his belief that by careful studies of insect faunas in their totalities we shall be able to obtain a "somewhat definite information of the sequence, extent, and effect of geological changes in the more recent periods," are pertinent and, we may hope, will prove fruitful.

These contributions to zoo-geography, to which we have first called attention, were after all but accessories to his main work, the overflow of a mind charged with resources. Though in a very subordinate and imperfect way the key-note of his after work may be said to have been struck in his very first paper, in which he concentrated his attention upon a single group; and passing over his next, which is confined to miscellaneous descriptions, we come at once upon synopses and monographs of greater or less extent and value. It is not our purpose here to specially praise this early work, which no one knew better than he, or more freely acknowledged, was marked by crudity and inexperience; but we wish to call attention to the point that at the very outset of his career he was not carried away by the wealth of material at his hand into random publication of miscellaneous material, after the fashion of the day, but comprehended with scholarly instinct the far higher worth of symmetrical and co-ordinated work and the training of his analytical powers. There was, therefore, from the first an orderly method in his work which shows itself even in his incomplete essays, and this was all the more remarkable from the fact, which cannot be too forcibly insisted upon, that previous to 1848, when his first so-called monograph appeared, there had been published by American entomologists three papers only of this character, all others having been mere catalogues or miscellaneous descriptions. One of these monographs was by Say on Cicindelidæ, published in 1817; the second by Major LeConte in 1845 on Histeridæ, and the third by Haldeman, as late as 1847, on the longicorn Coleoptera. LeConte, therefore, is seen to cut himself loose from the ordinary practice of his predecessors, and at once in this as in his geographical work to apply himself independently to the problems before him. How industrious he has been in this direction and what an influence he has exerted on the study of entomology in this country may be recognized by the mere statement that upwards of sixty monographic essays, some of them expanding to the form of a

Digitized by Google

volume, and all of them, after the first five years of work, direct and valuable contributions to the taxonomy of the order, have appeared from his pen.

We do not propose to analyze these, but only to call attention to two of the more important, and to point out that these monographic essays and synopses covered with fair equality the entire series of Coleoptera, as one may see by examining Henshaw's appendix to LeConte and Horn's "Classification of the Coleoptera of the United States," published last year. "They contain evidence," says his pupil and colleague, Dr. Horn, "of patient and original research and added greatly to science. His work was in every case an improvement on what had previously been done; he left a subject better than he found it."

These studies in the classification of the Coleoptera of our country culminated in a couple of remarkable works, published in 1876 and 1883, in each of which he was joined by his ardent coadjutor, Dr. Horn.

The first was a thorough monographic revision of the Rhynchophora or weevils of our country, forming an entire volume of the Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society, in which Dr. Horn elaborated a single family, the Otiorhynchidæ, while the remainder, or about three-fourths of the work, was prepared by Dr. LeConte. This memoir not only supplied a great need in American coleopterology, but it completely revolutionized the accepted classification of the day, and will make its way felt over a broader field than that it purported to cover. For LeConte, carrying out ideas which he had previously communicated to this Academy in 1867 and 1874, showed in this vast and inferior type of beetles the presence of characters, principally in the arrangement of the pieces on the under surface of the thorax, which isolated them completely from all other Coleoptera and allowed the use, in their subdivision, of characters drawn from quite different parts than were used in the subdivision of the normal series. The three great series which he thus established within the Rhyncophora were considered by him as the taxonomic equivalents of the six great groups, Adephaga, etc., in the normal series. Complaint has been made (from the other side of the ocean, of course) that such fundamental changes should not be "based upon the study, however accurate, of the fauna of a limited district or country," and entomologists are accordingly warned not to allow this essay "to disturb a generally accepted

Digitized by Google

classification." Such persons overlook the repeated statement of the learned authors that they have re-enforced their study of the American forms by the examination of many foreign types, and fail to notice that the principal novelty from which all the others sprang was announced years previous, allowing frequent opportunities to test the value of the proposed changes. It was a bold stroke, as Dr. Horn has pointed out, and it could not be expected that acceptance would at once be gained. The more closely it is examined the more rational does it appear, and we do not believe the day far distant when this as well as previous changes introduced by Dr. LeConte will find general acceptance.

The other work to which we referred, and which appeared only a few months before his death, was founded upon an uncompleted work which the Smithsonian Institution published in 1861, wholly his own, and which planned to give a general and systematic survey of all the genera and higher groups of North American Coleoptera. This first part included all the Isomera, excepting the Phytophaga, and was followed in the succeeding year by the Heteromera, the Phytophaga, generally classed in close proximity to the Rhyncophora, being still left untouched. When, in 1867, he had concluded on the absolute separation of the Rhyncophora from the other series of Coleoptera, he was free to carry out his unfinished work, and, in 1873, Crotch being then engaged in publishing a rapid series of synopses of the genera of our Chrysomelidæ, and Horn investigating the lesser family, Bruchidæ, LeConte took the remaining family, Cerambycidæ, in hand, and published a third installment of his classification. From this time until the monograph of Rhyncophora appeared he was engaged in the elaboration of that work. This finished, nothing remained but to complete the task to which he had pledged himself nearly a score of years before. To produce a homogeneous work, however, it was still necessary not only to revise much that had already been done, in the light of new material and the later investigations of others, but to break new ground as well over fields as yet comparatively untrodden.

A sense, however, of less enduring powers of work and the assistance, of which he gladly availed himself, which his colleague and former pupil, Dr. Horn, had rendered with such excellent results in the monograph of the Rhyncophora, led him to solicit anew the co-operation of Dr. Horn in the preparation of the monographic essays upon whose foundation it should rest, "hoping thereby to

Digitized by Google

lighten his own labor and prepare the work in a shorter time." How zealously Dr. Horn advanced to this work, his own thorough treatises, following rapidly one after the other, is sufficient proof; they are evidences not only of his industry and acumen, but of his loyalty to his friend and of the heartiness of his co-operation.

Three years ago, "when he realized that his health was failing, he expressed the desire," writes Dr. Horn, in his own modest account of their common task, "that I should join him in more active authorship in the work" which was to contain the final results of more than thirty years' systematic study of the Coleoptera of North America. "The first pages went to press in January, 1882, and the book was completed in March [1883], in time for him to realize that it had been at least well received. For obvious reasons," continues Dr. Horn, "I cannot dwell upon the merits even of his share of this work, except to say that his earlier edition is the basis of the present; without the former the latter might not have appeared. Evidences of his influence will be found on every page, and whatever it was my privilege to contribute was made possible entirely by his early instruction and guidance."

A comparison of the early and the later work, separated by an interval of over twenty years, is most instructive. The classification of Coleoptera, proposed by Olivier, founded primarily upon the supposed number of tarsal joints in the front and hind legs, was long so firmly established in entomological tradition, especially from the support given it by Latreille in his numerous general works, that it held some sway long after it was proved to be artificial. It served a useful purpose, however, in showing that this great assemblage of animals, of which more than a hundred thousand have long been known, was made up of a number of great series, or complexes, as LeConte called them, which, with some modifications of considerable importance, have been virtually accepted by entomologists for a long time. Their relative positions, however, and their equal or unequal taxonomic value have been a matter of considerable difference of opinion; there was a period of about a generation in length, previous to 1850, in which questions of this kind received a very large share of attention from leading entomologists, but the general consensus of opinion seemed to crystallize toward the view expressed by Lacordaire in his great work on the genera of Coleoptera, commenced in 1854, and this consensus was very closely reflected in the first edition of the "Classification of the

Digitized by Google

Coleoptera of North America"—not in any nomenclature of the complexes, for these were not even mentioned, but in the order in which the families followed one another. This succession was as follows: 1, Adephaga; 2, Clavicornia; 3, Lamellicornia; 4, Serricornia; 5, Heteromera. Beyond this, as stated earlier, the work did not proceed, as here, according to the accepted classification, the Rhynchophora were reached; but in 1873 the concluding part of the earlier edition was published, treating a portion of the Phytophaga, making them and not the Rhynchophora follow directly after the Heteromera, and so relegating this remaining complex to the last place.

This was the first serious disturbance of the accepted sequence of the complexes, and one upon which it would appear that LeConte's claim to highest distinction must ultimately rest with the world at large. It is much, very much, that the systematization of the vast array of Coleoptera of the United States may be said to be due wholly to his initiative and very largely to his personal studies and skill. But that he should venture to disturb fundamentally that system which had been the outcome of two generations of minute and patient investigation is, if it eventually stand the test of criticism, the work of a master hand. It goes without saying that he will never be forgotten for what he has done for his field of science in this country. It remains to be seen—for his prime work has still to stand the test of time—whether in future generations his fame shall be great elsewhere as here.

Consider now what must, in a sense, necessarily follow when a vast complex, like the Rhynchophora, is removed bodily from the midst of a series of complexes. It brings at once to the surface the question of the mutual relations of the great complexes hitherto separated by the Rhynchophora, and the whole fabric of classification must be narrowly investigated. And now begins the co-operative work of master and disciple, or rather we may now say the two colleagues, to which allusion was made in the quotation above from Dr. Horn's notice of Dr. LeConte. Hereafter we can speak of the work only as their joint production. Dr. Horn accepted fully in principle and in fact the views of Dr. LeConte concerning the Rhynchophora. Indeed, as Dr. LeConte states, the clew to his primary divisions of the Rhynchophora, proposed ten years ago, was given by an observation of Dr. Horn in his studies of certain Curculionidæ. These authors had together studied the structure and

Digitized by Google

discussed the relationship of a vast number of our Coleoptera; each was thoroughly acquainted with and had tested the value of the work of the other. In their two cabinets eleven thousand species of our beetles were at hand for verification of questionable points. What better opportunity could offer for such a joint work?

If now we compare the two editions of the work to see what changes were made, consequent upon the isolation of the Rhynchophora, we discover first of all that the Coccinellidæ and allied families are removed bodily from the Phytophaga with which they had from time immemorial been placed—a survival in fact of the purely tarsal system of classification—and placed in the Clavicorn series. This indeed had been done by Crotch in 1873 and 1874, but without defined reason, and working, as he did, side by side with LeConte and Horn, he doubtless shared their views of the Rhynchophora, and discussed with them the changes necessitated thereby. The remaining Phytophaga, including both the Longicornia and Chrysomelidæ, were placed before instead of after the Heteromera, as a part of the Isomerous series, and the relative position of the Lamellicornia was reversed—a return to the order of Latreille. The arrangement of the complexes, as it now appears in the "Classification" of Drs. LeConte and Horn, is as follows: 1, Adephaga; 2, Clavicornia (including Coccinellidæ, etc.); 3, Serricornia; 4, Lamellicornia; 5, Phytophaga (excluding Coccinellidæ, etc.); 6, Heteromera; 7, Rhynchophora.

These, however, are only changes in the grand relations of the great complexes. If we look more deeply we shall also find essential modifications in the minor arrangement of the families within the complexes, especially in the Clavicorn and Serricorn series, made necessary by the progress of investigation in all parts of the world, while other portions, like the Carabidæ, in the Adephagous series, have been altogether rewritten. As it stands, the work is the last expression of science regarding the classification of Coleoptera, and must exert a wide and powerful influence on the study of this great group, not in this country only, but throughout the world, especially wherever students are dealing with the beetles of the temperate zones. As Mr. A. Matthews has said: "The comprehensive lines on which it has been constructed will include (with, it may be, trifling modifications) the Coleoptera of both sides of the world." We think we can say unhesitatingly that very few, if any works, dealing with large groups of animals have been produced in this country—per-

Digitized by Google

haps none, if we except those of Professor J. D. Dana—which have had so much influence on the views of naturalists the world over upon the classification of the group concerned as this is sure to have, and we look confidently to the future for the verification of our judgment.

We have specified in some detail these two works of Dr. LeConte because they are the most extensive and the latest, and because they represent the others, summing up in a sense the investigations of an active, studious life. They everywhere bear the marks of a master, and none the less that he associated with himself one, much younger than he, who had been his pupil. This, too, is the mark of a master. There is no need, therefore, nor have we time, to pass in review the separate monographs and other papers upon Coleoptera which flowed from his pen. It is sufficient proof of his industry to point out that nearly half of our Coleoptera have been described for the first time by him (he has actually described or at least named 4,739 nominal species), and that in his works will be found original definitions of more than 1,100 of the higher groups, besides nearly 250 synoptic or analytic tables, some of them several times remodeled.*

These entomological studies, while they formed the principal features of LeConte's scientific life, were not the only ones which enjoyed his attention; for the liberal training he received, the paternal example, and his own general receptivity made him at home over much wider fields. One of his earliest papers was upon a mineralogical topic, and between 1848 and 1857, the ten most prolific years of his life, so far as the mere number of papers is concerned, he published various minor essays on geology, radiates, recent and fossil mammals, and ethnology, indicating the activity of his mind in many directions; and his general papers on various occasions, as well as his conversation, showed his familiarity with the advance of science in all directions.

That LeConte was the greatest entomologist this country has yet produced is unquestionable. *Facile princeps* will be the universal judgment both now and by posterity. His worth was early recognized. European entomologists who crossed the ocean paid

*An index to the Coleoptera, described by Dr. LeConte, has been published by Henshaw (Trans. Am. Ent. Soc., IX, 197), who also compiled, several years since, a list of his entomological writings (152 numbers, since increased to 180) which was published as the first of Dimmock's Special Bibliographies, issued with *Psyche*, Vol. II.

Digitized by Google

him their first visit; and all, charmed with his learning and affability, and the freedom with which he communicated his rich stores of knowledge, always spoke with enthusiasm of his erudition and his generous and simple spirit. It was the same on his visits abroad. His minute familiarity with all the details of structure through long series of varied degrees of complexity, his wonderfully retentive memory, his quick and accurate judgment, his courage and self-reliance, all gave his words weight, and his counsel and opinion were eagerly sought by his confreres. This is further shown by the fact that he was received into the limited circle of recipients of honorary membership in all the older and larger entomological societies of Europe.*

On several occasions, it was my chance, while in Europe, to follow in his steps, and it was always to find those who had seen him most hearty in his phrase. "No one who ever knew him," writes one after his death, "could fail to be fascinated by the amiability of his disposition, his universal knowledge, and surpassing intellect." There was a quiet ease and dignity in his person, which, while it in no wise hindered approach, gave evidence of a reserve of force and of a confidence not easly shaken. I remember well with what timidity I, an utter stranger, a mere boy, first ventured to seek him, a man but twelve years my senior, yet clothed with all the garb of learning—and with what kindness I was received and counseled. The pains he took for others, the time he has given, the immense labor he has undertaken in determining series of beetles for a hundred correspondents all over the country can never be known. The signs of it appear in all the entomological literature of the United States and Canada.

LeConte was not a man of many words; his language was precise and vigorous, and his style perhaps a little scholastic for these later days; at all events it was a style so individualized that I do not think he could have hidden the authorship of a letter or an essay he had written. He was of a philosophic turn of mind, and, with

* LeConte was a corresponding or honorary member of more than thirty societies, about equally distributed between this country and Europe. He was also one of the founders of the American Entomological Society. He was elected, in 1874, to the presidency of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, and at the time of his death had been several years a vice-president of the American Philosophical Society. He was a charter member of this academy.

Digitized by Google

a strong natural conservatism, was yet open-hearted to the truth. He accepted, rather preached, the modern evolutionary philosophy, but had little patience with those who looked upon this as a means of ridding the world of an intelligent control of "the Providence," as he expressed it, "which presides over and directs the system of evolution." Cautious and never destructive in the tendencies of his thought, he abhorred the crude speculations, whether of the irreverent or bigoted mind. "Let not our vanity," said he, "lead us to believe that, because God has deigned to guide our steps a few paces on the road of truth, we are justified in speaking as if He had taken us into intimate companionship and informed us of all His counsels." Those who knew him better than I can speak better of his personal worth. They have spoken, and they but reflect the feelings a less intimate acquaintance has given me. "We all knew him," writes one, "as a cultured scholar, a refined gentleman, a genial companion, a true friend. To me he was more." It is his colleague, Dr. Horn, who is speaking. "Our friendship ripened to an intimacy never shadowed by the slightest cloud." "Let the world reverence his memory as a discoverer," says Professor Lesley, his life-long friend, "as a philosopher, as a genius. I can only remember [him] as an engaging friend, a faithful friend, a speaker of the truth, a judicious adviser, a companion to think with, a reliable coadjutor to deal with, but still, above all, as a most affectionate and trustworthy friend."

Digitized by Google

APPENDIX ON THE ANCESTRY OF DR. LECONTE.

As the tracing of the pedigree of Dr. LeConte has been attended with some difficulty, and I have reached some conclusions at variance with family traditions, I have ventured to think that its publication may not be without interest. To enable my statements to be verified I append in a note* the sources of information that have been open to me, which are referred to throughout by the numbers prefixed to them; and in doing so I must return cordial thanks to those who have assisted me with original material. First, to Mrs. LeConte, who kindly placed in my hands all the documents bearing on the subject which were in the possession of Dr. LeConte, including the manuscript genealogical notes collected by his father, Major LeConte; second, to Prof. Walter LeConte Stevens, who has permitted me to use and publish what I wished from a MS. family record of great interest—a permission of which I have gladly and freely availed myself, both here and in the body of this article; third, to Rev. Chas. W. Baird, who has generously given me, from original data, many useful clews to the early history of the Huguenots in America, which he has collected at great pains; and fourth, to Prof. Joseph LeConte, who has given me many details, particularly with regard to the California members of the family.

It has long been a tradition in the LeConte family that they were descended from one Guillaume LeConte, who was with the Prince of Orange in Holland and England; came to this country toward the end of the seventeenth century; settled in the Huguenot colony at New Rochelle, near New

*1. Manuscript notes by Major J. E. LeConte.
2. Manuscript notes by Rev. C. W. Baird from original records.
3. Family records of the LeConte family (MSS.) by Prof. W. LeConte Stevens.
4. Manuscript notes by Prof. Joseph LeConte.
5. " entries in the old Elzevir Bible owned by Dr. LeConte.
6 " notes of Dr. J. L. LeConte.
7. " documents in State Archives, Albany.
8. Marriage licenses of New York previous to 1784 (Albany, 1860).
9. New York Genealogical Biographical Record. Vol. II (O'Callaghan), 1871.
10. Historical Magazine, Vol. V (New York), 1860.
11. Bolton's History of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the county of Westchester, New York, 1855.
12. Bolton's History of the county of Westchester, two vols., New York, 1848.
13. Wicke's History of Medicine in New Jersey. Newark, 1879. Based on MS. notes Prof. John LeConte.
14. Sharswood's Life of Major LeConte (Stett. ent. Zeit.).
15. Documentary History of New York. Four vols., Albany, 1850–1851.
16. Colonial History of New York. Fourteen vols., Albany, 1856–1883.
17. Stevens' History of Georgia. New York, 1847.
18. Calendar of Historical MSS. in Secretary of State's office at Albany. Part II, Albany, 1866.
19. Baird's History of the Huguenot Emigration to America. Two vols., New York, 1885.

[A few changes have been made in the original of the appendix since the appearance of this History.]

Digitized by Google

York city; and married a Marguerite de Valleau, of Martinique (the date of the marriage being exactly given), through whom the descent came. It has also been claimed that two others of the same name, his nephews, came over with him and with the Chevalier DeLancy, who landed in New York July 7, 1686.

In a "list of Huguenots of the colony at New Rochelle," however, which Dr. LeConte had in his possession, and the exact origin of which is unknown, we find the following names: François LeConte, Isaac LeConte, Jaques LeCompte, Jacques LeConnet, Guillaume LeConte, Pierre LeConte, and Henri LeConte, seven names. As the list includes 371 names of males alone, and the name of Etienne Delancy among others enters it, while the census of 1710 give only 67 "male Christians" at New Rochelle, it is evident that the list includes all the Huguenots of the region about New York.

In any case we have here to deal with six LeContes, provided we look upon Jaques LeCompte and Jacques LeConnet as the same, as we perhaps may. But in truth we have a record of two more in this region before 1700: Thomas, who, like Henri mentioned in the list, is the reputed nephew of Guillaume, and came over with DeLancy in 1686, and John, Jean, or Johannes, to whom letters of denization were granted in New York July 29, 1686 [7], and who was probably the brother of Pierre. That John is not mentioned in the list indicates, it appears to me, that the list is ancient and independent, for repeated records of John are to be found which would not have escaped a search among documents.

We have then (I) Jacques, of New Rochelle, whose birth-place is unknown, who was perhaps the brother of II, and the first record of whom we find in 1691, but in a document which makes it appear probable that he was in New York or the West Indies in 1689. (II) François, of New Rochelle, formerly of Port L'Evéque, perhaps brother of I, whose marriage is on record as taking place in New York in 1693 [2]. (III) Pierre, of Staten Island, born in Dieppe, probably the brother of IV and possibly of VIII, and naturalized in New York September 27, 1687 [2]. (IV) Jean, probably brother of III, naturalized in 1686 [7, 19]. (V) Isaac, mentioned above, of whom nothing more has been discovered. (VI) Thomas, of New York, originally from some place in Normandy, brother of VII and nephew of VIII, who is supposed to have arrived with DeLancy in 1686. (VII) Henri, of New York, from Normandy, brother of VI and nephew of VIII, who is supposed to have come over with DeLancy, and of whom we have record as a lieutenant of a foot company in New York before 1691 [7]. (VIII) Guillaume, of New York, formerly of Rouen, possibly the brother of III and the uncle of VI and VII, whose name we first find on documents in 1702. The descendants of these are recorded in order further on.

In the above I have distinguished between I and VIII by calling one Jacques and the other Guillaume, as in the list of Huguenots. Heretofore they have been taken for the same person, and called indifferently Jacques, Guillaume, and William. That they are two personages seems highly probable, and as it is from one of them that the family we are interested in has

Digitized by Google

descended, I have spared no pains to determine the point. The evidence is as follows:

I a. Guillaume LeConte is found in the list of Huguenots arriving in New York from St. Christopher and Martinique in November, 1686 [19].

I b. In the State Archives at Albany, among the historical documents, Vol. XXXVII, f. 247, we find a petition with the signature—

asking that letters of administration be given to him on the estate of "mr. James Laty his father in Law" who died since he had given a "Letter of atturney made and written at the Island of St. Christophers bearing date the 16th of March 168$\frac{8}{9}$." The petition was granted September 9, 1691. His wife's name, therefore, was Laty. This I take to refer to I:

I c. In the "List of the towne of New Rochelle &c XBr 9th 1710" [15] the names of the inhabitants are evidently given by families, in which the father's name is placed first, next the mother, followed by the children, where, excepting in cases of great disparity, the boys precede the girls. In this list we have two LeConte families, as follows, the figures giving the ages: William LeConte, 52; Mary LeConte, 42; William LeConte Jr., 16; Hester LeConte, 17; Jean LeConte, 6; ffrancis LeConte, 45; Mary LeConte, 55; Josiah LeConte, 13; Mary LeConte, 18. Supposing the older William to be the same as the Guillaume (=Jacques, I) of the preceding paragraph, he was born about 1659, his wife (Mary Laty) about 1669, his oldest son (William) about 1695, his oldest daughter (Hester) about 1694, and his youngest son (Jean) about 1705.

II a. The ancestor of Dr. LeConte (VIII) is stated in the family traditions to have been in the army of William III when in Ireland in 1690, and to have afterwards emigrated to this country. It is therefore highly improbable that he was given a letter of attorney at St. Christophers in 1689.

II b. The traditions also state especially with date (February 16, 1701) his marriage to Marguerritte de Valleau, of Martinique; whereas in 1710 the living wife of I was named Mary.

II c. The marriage license of "William LeConte and Margaret Mahoe," April 17, 1703, is on record in New York (Office of Surrogate. Wills. lib. VII, p. 100) [2]. This again could not refer to I.

II d. The will of "Guillaume LeCounte," with the signature as follows:

Digitized by Google

is also on record at the same office. It mentions his "deer wife Margarita," and names three children: Guillaume, Esther, and, toward the end of the will, Pierre. The will was acknowledged and proved March 2, 17$\frac{1}{1}\frac{0}{1}$. As we have the dates of the births of all these children, we may conclude that in 1710, that is, at the time of the census of New Rochelle above mentioned, the two families we are attempting to separate stood thus:

I		VIII	
Jacques LeConte	æt. 52	Guillaume LeConte	æt. 51
Mary Laty (his wife)	" 42	Margaret Mahoe (his wife)	" ?
Children.		Children.	
Hester	æt. 17	William (by former wife)	æt. 7
William	" 16	Pierre	" 6
Jean	" 6	Esther	" 4

This seems the only way to settle the otherwise conflicting evidence, and when we consider that these two men, of the same age, emigrating to New York at about the same time, each having three children, of whom two were named William and Hester (or Esther), it is certainly not surprising that they should have been confounded. The only difficulties in the way are the considerable resemblance of the two signatures (considering the interval of about twenty years between them), and the fact that Mrs. Dr. LeConte does not recognize in the seal attached to Guillaume's will above mentioned any now in her possession said to have descended from him. This seal gives a full-length effigy of a knight in armor on a rectangular plate surrounded by cloud-like ornaments. But the fact that different seals exist which have descended from him renders this fact of less importance.

It might also be added that there are several other unaccountable facts which affect the early history of the LeContes. I have mentioned that the names of only two families occur in the census of New Rochelle in 1710, although all the original LeContes with whom we are concerned came over to New York and vicinity before or about the year 1700. There is also another list of New Rochelle inhabitants, said to be of the year 1698, but more probably belonging to 1712 (N. Y. Coll. MSS. XLII, f. 59), in which no LeContes at all are mentioned, although 188 whites between the ages of 1 and 67 are given. Nor does the name occur in a similar list of 517 persons (including about 220 white males) of Westchester county (*ibid*, f. 60). Nor in the census of the city of New York "about the year 1703," where all the "masters of familys" are entered (Doc. Hist. N. Y. I, 611-24).

My own brief reseaches having brought out so many facts I can hardly doubt that a closer investigation of early State and ecclesiastical documents will determine very certainly the relations of all the parties concerned. On the conclusions given above as a basis the following tables of lineage are presented:

Jacques b. 1658, m. Mary Laty, of St. Christopher (b. 1668) [7, 15].
Hester b. 1693, m. Ezechiel Bonyot (nat. Ap. 21, 1719) [2, 15].

Digitized by Google

[Children of Hester (b. 1693).]
Marianne bap. Feb. 5, 1719 [2].
Esther " Aug. 25, 1717 [2].
Ezechiel " Dec. 16, 1719 [2].
Marie " Ap. 30, 1721 [2].
Guillaume b. 1694, m. Annette Martha ——— [7, 12].
Francis m. ——— [12].
Paul d. 1815 [12].
Josiah m. Anne Riché [12].
John m. (lic. Jan. 9, 1756) Catharine Van Horne [9, 12].*
Thomas [12].
John m. Hannah Ferris [12].
Samuel [12].
Hannah [12].
Eleanor [12].
Joseph m. Hannah Raymond [12].
Platt [12].
Francis [12].
Joseph [12.]
Elizabeth [12.]
Josiah m. i., Mary Angevine; ii (lic. Oct. 29, 1762), Susannah Soulice [8, 12.]
Peter, lost at sea [12.]
John m. Sarah Badeau [12.]
Josiah [12.]
William [12.]
John [12.]
Mary m. Nathaniel Lawrence [12.]
Jean b. 1705; commiss. on part of gen. ass. 1736; memb. gen. ass. from Richmond Co. 1750; d. early in 1756; m. ——— [2, 15, 18.]
John m. without license in Jan. 1756 [18.] †
FRANÇOIS b. 1666, at Port L'Evéque (son of François LeCompte and Marie Amon); m. May 31, 1693, Catherine Lavandier, wid. Daniel Marchand; victualler; nat. Ap. 18, 1695; was living in 1710 [2, 11, 15, 19.]
Marie b. 1693 [15.]
François b. Mar. 2, bap. Mar. 4, 1694; moved away from New Rochelle before 1710?; was living there in 1762 [2, 11, 15, 19.]
Josias b. Feb. 20, bap. Feb. 21, 1697; m. Esther Besly, da. Olivier and Susanne Besly; was living in 1743 (see below under Susanne, grandda. Guillaume) [2, 11, 19.]
Judit b. Dec. 18, 1729, bap. Jan. 25, 1730 [2.]

---

*Bolton makes this John to have married Catharine, but it is impossible that he should have been married when his great-grandfather was only 62 years old; another John is certainly meant. It is indeed far more likely that it was his great-grandfather's brother Jean's son John. (q. v.)

†Perhaps it is this John who afterwards married with a license, Oct. 29, 1762, Susannah Soulice (see also note above).

Digitized by Google

[Children of Josias (b. 1697), continued.]
François b. Feb. 14, 1732, bap. April 7, 1732; sponsors Olivier and Susanne Besly [2.]
Josias m. Susannah Bertain, da. Peter and Catherine Bertain [2.] *
Susannah b. March 11, 1751, bap. March 31, sponsors Josias LeConte senr. and Cath. Bertain [2.]
Peter b. Feb. 12, 1753, bap. March 11, 1753, sponsors Peter Bertain and Esther (Besly) LeConte [2.]
Madeleine, b. March 15, bap. March 20, 1698, d. before 1710 [2, 15, 19.]

PIERRE b. at Dieppe, nat. Sept. 27, 1687, d. 1704; m. Margaret ——— [2, 12, 19.]
Jean [12.]
Pierre [12.]
Jacques [12.]

JEAN nat. July 29, 1686, d. 1697; m. Hester Lakeman (da. Abraham Lakeman, d. about 1702; exec. of will were Peter LeConte and Abraham Lakeman) [7, 12, 19.]
Susanne b. about 1696 [7, 19.]

ISAAC.

THOMAS m. i, Gertrude van Hoorn, of Staten Island; ii, Elizabeth Broome, of New York; had no children [1.]

HENRI m. Aug. 5, 1686, Grace Walroud, da. George Walroud, of Barbadoes [1, 2.]
Walroud b. July 30, 1691, d. Aug. 5, 1692 [1, 2.]

GUILLAUME b. at Rouen March 6, 1659, d. at New York, Sept. 15, 1720; m. i, Feb. 16, 1701, Margueritte de Valleau, da. Pierre Joyeulx de Valleau, of Martinique; d. between Dec. 3, 1702, and April, 1703 [1, 3, 4, 6.]
William b. Dec. 3, 1702; lieut. militia company at New Rochelle 1740; d. 1760; m. Anne Elise (Marianne) Beslie [1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 13.]
Anne bap. Oct. 23, 1733, sponsor her aunt Esther; m. April 14, 1764 (lic. July 1, 1763), Peter Flandreau [1, 2, 3, 8.]
A daughter [1.]
Susanne bap. Feb. 8, 1727, sponsor Pierre LeConte (brother or uncle?); m. William Bayly, brother of Olivier Besly (see above under Josias, son of François) [2, 3, 6.]
William LeConte b. Aug. 8, 1745, bap. Aug. 25, 1745, sponsors William LeConte grf., Olivier and Susanna Besly, uncle and aunt; m. Sarah Pell, da. Joseph Pell, 3d Lord of Pelham manor [2, 3.]
Susanne.

† Peter and Catherine had another daughter, Catherine, who married Isaac Sicard about 1750 [2.]

Digitized by Google

[Children of William LeConte (b. 1745), continued.]
William LeCompte.
Joseph.
Ann Bayley m. Capt. James Hague.
James.
William D. D. Baptist clergyman b. about 1805.
John Bayley.
Glorianna.
Joseph.
Richard (Bailey) b. 1745,? surg. Engl. army; m. i, Mrs. Post, née Charleton, no issue (child by former marriage Dr. Wright Post); m. ii, Charlotte Amelia Barclay [3.]
Child, name unknown [3.]
Eliza Ann (Elizabeth) m. ——— Seton,? known as "Mother Seton" [3.]
Richard [3.]
Barclay [3.]
William [3.]
Guy Carleton m. Grace Roosevelt [3.]
James Roosevelt, Archb. Baltimore [3.]
Richard [3.]
Guy Carleton [3.]
William [3.].

——— m. ii, April 17, 1703, Margaret Mahoe [Mahant], of New Rochelle, d. Sept. 15, 1720 [2.]

Pierre M. D. b. July 25, 1704, bap. Dec. 10, 1704, by Rev. Mr. Bondet, spons. Philip Cazier and Mary Vergereau, née Mahant; d. Jan 29, 1768, at Matawan, N. J.; m. i, March 18, 1733, Margaret Pintard (d. Jan. 30, 1736) by Rev. Gerardus Haerghoordt, no issue; m. ii, Jan. 9, 1737, by Wm. Brimley, j. p., Valeria Eatton (b. Shrewsbury March 17, 1715, da. John Eatton and Joanna Wardle, of Eattonville; d. 1788 in Orange) [1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 13.]

William b. March 20, 1738, bap. April 12, 1738, by Rev. J. Mills; spons. fath., moth., and Joseph Eatton; d. Savannah Nov. 4, 1788; m. May 6, 1782, Elizabeth Lawrence [1, 3, 4, 5.]

John Eatton b. Sept. 2, 1739, bap. Nov. 25, 1741, by Rev. W. Tennant; d. New Jersey Jan. 11, 1822; m. 1776, Jane Sloan [1, 3, 4, 5.]

William b. March 4, 1777; d. at New York October 23, 1807 (1806?—1, 3, 4, 13) [5.]

Louis b. Shrewsbury, N. J., Aug. 4, 1782; d. Jan. 9, 1838; m. in Georgia Jan. 30, 1812, Ann Quartermann, b. Oct. 26, 1793; d. Dec. 24, 1826 [1, 3, 4, 5, 13].

William b. Liberty Co., Ga., Nov. 18, 1812; d. Jan. 25, 1841; m. Nov. 10, 1833, Sarah A. Nisbet [3, 4].

James Nisbet m. Mary Gordon [3, 4].

Ann m. Clifford Anderson [3, 4, 13].

Digitized by Google

[Children of Ann, daughter of William (b. 1812), continued.]
Sarah Nisbet [3].
Halbert [3].
William LeConte [3].
Clifford [3].
James LeConte [3].
Louis Joseph [3].
Mary Lee [3].
Anne [3].
Robert Lanier [3].
Ophelia [3].
Custis Nottingham [3].
Laura Boykin [3].
Ethel [3].
William Louis m. Virginia Trimble [3].
William Louis [3].
James [3].
Nisbet [3].
Sarah Ophelia m. Frank H. Stone [3].
Charles [3].
William [3].
Henrietta [3].
Sarah Ophelia [3].
Anna Louisa [3].
Frank LeConte [3].
Clifford [3].
Mary [3].
Josephine [3].
Walker [3].
Jane b. Woodmanston, Ga., Nov. 23, 1814; d. San Francisco, Oct. 28, 1876; m. Dec. 12, 1833, John M. B. Harden, M. D. [3, 4].
Lewis LeConte d. 1839? [3, 4].
Matilda Jane m. T. Sumner Stevens [3].
Annie Rosa [3].
John LeConte m. Anne Way [3].
Louis LeRoy [3].
William Sumner [3].
John Samuel [3].
Ada Rosalie [3].
Mary Lillian [3].
Anne Eliza m. C. B. Adams M. D. [3, 4, 13].
Cornelius [3].
David [3].
John Harden [3].
Ada Louisa [3].

Digitized by Google

[Children of Louis (b. 1782), continued.]

Elizabeth b. 1816, d. 1818 [3, 4].

John b. Woodmanston, Ga., Dec. 4, 1818; m. July 20, 1841, Eleanor Josephine Graham, b. New York, Nov. 22, 1824. [3, 4].

Mary Tallulah b. Savannah, Ga., Feb. 23, 1843; d. Columbia, S. C., March 21, 1868 [4].

Louis Julian b. Savannah, Ga., March 3, 1845; m. 1880, Oakland, Cal., Mary Harmon [4].

John Cecil b. Athens, Ga., Jan. 25, 1850; d. Oakland, Cal., Nov. 19, 1874 [4].

Lewis b. Woodmanston, Ga., Jan. 7, 1821; d. Oct. 20, 1851; m. July 25, 1843, Harriet Nisbet.

Harriet Eveline [3].

William d. Nov. 4, 1876 [3].

John Nisbet [3].

Louis Eatton m. Caroline Adams [3].

Eva [3].

Caroline [3].

Joseph b. Woodmanston, Ga., Feb. 26, 1823; m. Jan. 14, 1847, Caroline Elizabeth Nisbet, b. at Athens, Ga., Jan. 1, 1828 [3, 4].

Emma Florence b. Milledgeville, Ga., Dec. 10, 1847; m. 1869, Farish C. Furman [3, 4].

Katherine Carter [3].

Elizabeth Nisbet [3].

Sarah Elizabeth b. Cambridge, Mass., Nov. 11, 1850; m. 1877, Robert Means Davis, of So. Carolina [3, 4].

Joseph LeConte [3].

Henry Campbell [3].

Robert Means [3].

Isabel b. 1884 [4].

Josephine Eloise b. Columbia, S. C., Sept. 20, 1859; d. Sept. 12, 1861 [4].

Caroline Eatton b. Columbia, S. C., Nov. 3, 1863 [4].

Joseph Nisbet b. Oakland, Cal., Feb. 7, 1870 [4].

Anne b. Woodmanston, Ga., March 26, 1825; d. Sept. 2, 1866; m. June 8, 1843, Dr. Josiah Peter Stevens, b. Nov. 17, 1818 [3, 4].

Ella Florine b. Woodmanston, Ga., Feb. 1, 1845 [3].

Walter LeConte b. Gordon (then Cass) Co., Ga., June 17, 1847 [3].

Josiah Percy b. Lumpkin, Stewart Co., Ga., March 23, 1852; m. Jeannie Alexander [3].

Louis Oliver b. Walthourville, Liberty Co., Ga., March 1, 1856 [3].

Digitized by Google

[Children of Anne (b. 1825), continued.]
Anna Louisa b. Baker Co., Ga., Aug. 21, 1860; d. Oct. 4, 1867 [3].
Mabel Caroline b. Walthourville, Ga., July 30, 1862; d. Decatur, Ga., Aug. 31, 1874 [3].
John Eatton b. Shrewsbury, N. J., Feb. 22, 1784; d. Philadelphia, Nov. 21, 1860; m. July 22, 1821, Mary Anne Hampton Lawrence, da. Jonathan Hampton Lawrence and Joanna Blanchard [1, 2, 3, 4, 5].
Edward b. May 10, 1822; d. Feb. 9, 1823 [1].
Edward b. Nov. 5, 1823; d. Jan. 25, 1824 [1].
John Lawrence b. New York, May 13, 1825; d. Philadelphia, Nov. 15, 1883; m., Philadelphia, Jan. 10, 1861, Helen S. Grier, da. Hon. Robert C. Grier and Isabella Rose [1, 3, 5.]
John Eatton b. Jan. 17, 1862; d. May 19, 1885 [5.]
Isabella Rose b. July 10, 1863, d. Aug. 26, 1863 [5.]
Robert Grier b. July 17, 1865 [5.]
Margaret b. July 11, 1741; bap. Nov. 25, 1741, by Rev. W. Tennant; d. Sept. 9, 1812; m. Rev. Jedediah Chapman, who was b. Sept. 27, 1841; d. May 22, 1813, and by first wife, Blanche Smith, had William Smith, Robert Hett, John Hubbard [5, 13.]
Peter LeConte b. Jan. 8, 1778, d. Sept. 17, 1836; took name of LeConte and m. Jerusha Bishop (the following from History of the Chapman family).
Margaretta b. July 19, 1806, m. Abraham Myers.
LeConte.
Gustavus Adolphus.
William b. June 5, 1808, d. Dec. 12, 1850.
Chlorinda b. April 16, 1810, d. July 17, 1842; m. April 25, 1839, George Miller (no issue).
Mary b. Aug. 28, 1812.
Robert b. Jan. 23, 1815, d. Nov. 30, 1842.
Porter [Rev.] b. Feb. 27, 1817, d. Aug. 16, 1847; m. Sept. 24, 1846, Anna Brooks (no issue).
Caroline b. Sept. 28, 1819; m. May 1, 1849, Cornelius V. H. Morris (one daughter).
John Thomas b. April 24, 1779; m. Elizabeth Tooker (nine children)
Valeria Maria b. ——, d. Oct. 31, 1847; m. Oct. 11, 1808, James Reynolds (four children).
Thomas b. June 23, 1747, bap. July 26, 1747, by Rev. W. Tennant; d. Georgia, Sept. 27, 1770 [1, 5.]
Peter b. April 13, 1751, bap. May 19, 1751, by Rev. W. Tennant; d. Georgia, Nov. 23, 1776 [1, 3, 4, 5.]
Esther b. July 6, 1706 [1, 6.]

Digitized by Google

There are also records of the following marriages which I cannot place:
Boudewyn LeConte and Elsie Frederick, lic. May. 14, 1756 [9.]
Sarah LeCont and John Sternberg, lic. Oct. 20, 1763 [8.]

The descent of Dr. LeConte on his mother's side—a Lawrence—is as follows: William Lawrence, who died in 1680, married Elizabeth Smith. Their son Joseph had a son Jonathan, who was born in 1690 and died in 1775. His son Isaac, born in 1729 (d. 1781), married Mary A. Hampton. Their son Jonathan Hampton (b. 1763, d. 1844), married Joanna Blanchard, and had Mary Anne Hampton Lawrence, who married Major LeConte.

The foregoing biographical sketch was also printed, with a portrait of Dr. LeConte, in the Transactions of the American Entomological Society, Vol. XI, 28 pp.

The following notices of Dr. LeConte have been published elsewhere:

By J. P. Lesley and G. H. Horn, Proc. Amer. Phil. Soc. XXI, 291-299.
[By H. A. Hagen], Proc. Amer. Acad. Arts Sc., XIX, 511-516.
By C. V. Riley, Psyche, IV, 107-110.
By F. G. Schaup, Bull. Brookl. Entom. Soc., VI, No. 8; accompanied by a portrait and bibliography, 9 pp.
By A. Sallé, Ann. Soc. Entom. France, April 1884, 6 pp.

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

3 2044 107 288 508

Digitized by Google